

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,576	11/21/2000	John F. Fairclough	TRO4-BK25	2130
21611 75	90 10/24/2005		EXAMINER	
SNELL & WILMER LLP			WINTER, JOHN M	
600 ANTON BOULEVARD SUITE 1400			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
COSTA MESA, CA 92626			3621	

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/717,576	FAIRCLOUGH ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	John M. Winter	3621					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period wince the reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status .							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 Au	aust 2005						
,	action is non-final.						
<u>'=</u>	·						
closed in accordance with the practice under E.							
•	.,						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4-7,9-11,16-19 and 23-26</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4,5,9 and 10</u> is/are rejected.							
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	, , , , , ,	, ,					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<u> </u>		(4) (0					
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)	(PTO-413)					

Application/Control Number: 09/717,576

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

Status

Claims 1,4-7 9-11, 16-19 and 23-26 remain pending

Response to Arguments

The Applicants arguments filed on August 6, 2005 have been fully considered. The amended claims are rejected in view of the newly discovered references Bartoli et al (US Patent 6,407,268)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pare, Jr. et al. (US Patent No 6,230,148) in view of Walker et al. (US Patent 6,338,049) and further in view of Bartoli et al (US Patent 6,407,268).

As per claim 1,

Pare Jr. et al. ('148) discloses a method for printing and verifying checks over a network comprising the following steps:

connecting a client computer to a merchant server at a location remote from the client computer; (column 14, lines 34-42)

transmitting an order from the client computer to the merchant server; (figure 4) selecting payment by check; (figure 6)

connecting the client computer to a check server; (column 13, lines 66-67; column 14, lines 1-19)

inputting customer data at the client computer; (column 13, line 64)

transmitting customer data from the client computer to the check server; (column 13, line 66-67; column 14, lines 1-2)

transmitting customer data from the check server to a check verification server; (column 15, line 1-7)

transmitting an approval from the check verification server to the check server (column 15, line 1-7)

Art Unit: 3621

Pare Jr. et al. ('148)does not explicitly disclose printing a check including data from the check server as a negotiable instrument at a remote location. Walker et al ('049) discloses printing a check including data from the check server as a negotiable instrument at a remote location. (Column 6, lines 9-20) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Pare Jr. et al. ('148) method with the Walker et al ('049) method in order to allow the seller to generate physical proof of the transaction.

Pare Jr. et al. ('148)does not explicitly disclose confirming the order or payment by a message from the merchant server to the client computer and the check server by sending an electronic mail message to the client computer and the check server, where the receipt of the confirming message by the check server determines whether printing of the check is permitted Bartoli et al ('268) discloses confirming the order or payment by a message from the merchant server to the client computer and the check server by sending an electronic mail message to the client computer and the check server, where the receipt of the confirming message by the check server determines whether printing of the check is permitted. (Column 8, lines 13-55; figure 2) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Pare Jr. et al. ('148) method with the Bartoli et al ('268) method in order to allow the seller to generate physical proof of the transaction.

As per claim 4,

Pare Jr. et al. ('148) discloses the method of Claim 1

Pare Jr. et al. ('148)does not explicitly disclose the check is printed by a secure printer connected to a check printing station at the remote location. Walker et al ('049) discloses the check is printed by a secure printer connected to a check printing station at the remote location (Figure 2C). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Pare Jr. et al. ('148) method with the Walker et al ('049) method in order to allow the seller to generate physical proof of the transaction.

Claim 5,9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pare, Jr. et al. (US Patent No 6,230,148) in view of Hills et al. (US Patent No 6,164,528)

As per claim 5,

Pare Jr. et al. ('148) discloses the method of Claim 1

Pare Jr. et al. ('148) does not explicitly disclose storing the approval from the check verification server in a merchant file in the check server; downloading the merchant file from the check server to a check printing station. Hils et al. ('528) discloses storing the approval from the check verification server in a merchant file in the check server; (Abstract) downloading the merchant file from the check server to a check printing station (Column 12, lines 54-67) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Pare Jr. et al. ('148) method with the Hills et al. ('528) method in order to protect the merchant from fraud caused by a customer with insufficient funds to cover the check.

Application/Control Number: 09/717,576

Art Unit: 3621

As per claim 9, Pare Jr. et al. ('148) discloses the method of Claim 6 where the network is the Internet. (Figure 4)

As per claim 10,

Pare Jr. et al. ('148) discloses the method of Claim 6

where the approval comprises the customer data transmitted from the client computer to the check server. (column 15, line 1-7)

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 16-19, 23-26 are allowable over the prior art record.

Claims 6,7 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached at (571) 272-6712. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application/Control Number: 09/717,576 Page 5

Art Unit: 3621

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687

[Official communications; including After Final communications labeled

"Box AF"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Examiner in the Knox Building, 50 Dulany St. Alexandria, VA.

JMW October 17, 2005 SUL